DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 686 UD 018 943

AUTHOR Cummings, Scott
TITLE White Ethnics, Racial Prejudice, and Labor Market Segmentation.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; Economic Climate; *Ethnic Groups; Immigrants; Labor Legislation; *Labor Market; *Labor Supply; Literature Reviews; Manpower Utilization; *Race Relations; *Racial Discrimination; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS *White Ethnics

ABSTRACT

The contemporary conflict between blacks and selected white ethnic groups (Catholic immigrants, Jews) is the product of competition for jobs in the secondary labor market. Radical economists have described the existence of a dual labor market within the American economy. The idea of this segmented labor market provides a useful way to integrate the conceptual arguments embodied in existing structural explanations of ethnic conflict. Under the hypothesis that the most intolerant ethnic groups are those employed in those labor markets in which blacks are also in search of employment opportunities, data from a 15 city survey of white ethnic groups (conducted in the late 1960s by Campbell and Schuman) were examined in light of four variables: (1) family income; (2) industrial sector; (3) occupation; and (4) relative presence of blacks within different industrial sectors and occupational categories. Results of the analysis suggest that high racial intolerance is strongly associated with a group's relationship to the economy, as well as with the larger socio-historical factors connected with industrialization and time of immigration. Additionally, political conflict over immigration legislation, exclusion acts, and contract labor laws was related to the same labor market practices which produced ethnic antagonism. It appears that while members of particular working and middle class ethnic groups are busy protecting their own interests, the crucial factor generating competition in the labor market, a tenuous and unstable economy, is never clearly identified or addressed. (Author/WI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DEC 18 1978

NOV 30 1978

ED164686

WHITE ETHNICS, RACIAL PREJUDICE, AND LABOR MARKET SEGMENTATION

Scott Cummings

Institute of Urban Studies
The University of Texas at Arlington

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Scott Cummings

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UDO 18943

LABOR MARKET PROCESSES AND CONFLICT BETWEEN ETHNIC AND RACIAL MINORITIES

This article develops the theory that conflict between Catholic immigrants, Blacks, and Jews is rooted in segmented labor market conditions. The interpretation developed is premised on the general idea that contemporary conflict between Blacks and selected white ethnic groups is a product of competition for jobs in the secondary labor market. The contemporary rhetoric surrounding the new ethnicity is also explained as a product of labor market processes.

While several scholars have argued that ethnic conflict is a result of labor market processes, data describing this relationship are not readily available. Bonacich (1972, 1975, 1976) has described the impact of hiring practices which often pit ethnic groups against one another in a struggle over jobs, living space, and financial security. She posits that when the labor market is split along ethnic lines, and one ethnic group has managed to secure a competitive advantage in the contest for jobs, employers often initiate hiring practices which pit the established group against the ethnically different group which is attempting to enter the work force. Historically, these labor practices have taken the shape of recruiting strikebreakers from the ethnically different, cheaper labor pool. This cheaper labor pool can be used to undercut and undermine the bargaining position of the group which has already established itself (Cole, 1962; Erickson, 1957; Hill, 1973; Kornblum, 1974). Historically, conflict between Irish Catholic workers and established Protestant groups can be interpreted within Bonacich's explanatory framework. Later conflict between the Irish and newly arriving Southern and Eastern European immigrants fits the split labor market theory as well.

Bonacich (1972) is suggesting that employers often have the power to initiate hiring policies which generate, feed, and sustain ethnic antagonism. While these

labor market practices need not purposefully be designed to feed ethnic antagonism, they often do so regardless of intention (Cole, 1962; Hill, 1973; Kornblum, 1974). Many cities in the industrial North and Mid-west have been the destinations of Blacks in search of employment and economic opportunity. Additionally, these cities have also been the point of arrival and employment for many immigrants from southern and eastern Europe (Dinerstein and Reimers, 1975; Handlin, 1959). Consequently, it is not surprising to find that cities like Boston, Chicago, Detroit, New York, and Philadelphia have been the scenes of recent conflict between Blacks and various white ethnic groups (Barbara, 1972; Berube and Gittell, 1969; Conforti, 1972; Curvin, 1972; Ford, 1975; Kornblum, 1974; Weed, 1973). As these cities experience declining economic conditions, it seems logical to posit that increased competition for jobs, city services, and housing will result. Urban employers seeking cheaper Black labor may provide incentives motivating white ethnics to use prejudice and discrimination as a weapon to secure their competitive advantage.

Other theorists have identified similar labor market processes which hypothetically generate ethnic conflict. A unique dimension associated with these interpretations is found in the idea that public rather than privately sponsored labor practices feed ethnic antagonism. That is, recent social legislation is viewed by some policy analysts as a mechanism undercutting the advantage of one group over another, the consequence of which is to inflame relations between ethnic and racial groups (Glazer, 1976). The war on poverty, the political assault on racial injustice, civil rights legislation were obviously not rationally designed to pit Blacks against white ethnics in a struggle over scarce resources. Irrespective of design or intention, however, some writers contend that a latent consequence of the legislative attack on racial injustice

was an apparent increase in ethnic antagonism (Glazer, 1976; Greeley, 1974; Hentoff, 1972; Katz, 1967; Miller, 1972; Novak, 1971; Phillips, 1969; Rabb, 1972). Specifically, to explain conflict between white ethnics and Blacks solely within an individualistic framework emphasizing irrational bigotry and prejudice overlooks the possibility of a socio-economic conflict of interest between the two groups (Glazer, 1976; Krickus, 1976). One of the immediate consequences of busing schemes in some Northern cities was to challenge ethnic control of community institutions (Ford, 1975), and hence, control over the benefits and services provided by those institutions. Further, affirmative action hiring, open-admissions, apprentice-ship programs ear-marked for Blacks, have the potential consequence of threatening economic opportunities for white ethnic workers competing for the same jobs and benefits (Glazer, 1976). Additionally, even though the proportion of tax dollars spent on increased welfare services is meager in comparison to military spending, any hint of a tax increase promising no definite payoff in terms of expanded public employment opportunities or services for the urban ethnic will probably be met with resistance--especially when the additional services are perceived to benefit only Blacks (Coles, 1966; Ford, 1975; Schrag, 1970a, 1970b).

A third interpretation closely linked to the idea that public and privately sponsored labor practices feed ethnic conflict emphasizes the industrial sectors in which various immigrant groups initially secured employment (Yancey, Erickson, Julian, 1976). During the 1880's industrialists systematically recruited skilled crastsmen from Wales, England, Germany and Sweden to work in the steel mills, and serve as machinists, carpenters, miners and textile workers (Berthoff, 1968; Erickson, 1957). Throughout the period of labor intensive industrial development, unskilled workers were recruited from Southern and Eastern Europe. The concentration of Eastern European groups in the extraction, mining and

steel industries has been described by several scholars (Fitch, 1969; Golab, 1973; Greene, 1968; Rosenblum, 1973; Stolarik, 1972). Jewish and Italian involvement in small business enterprise, the garment and construction industries, and in the public sector has also been discussed by numerous historians, as has Irish Catholic movement into the public sector (Clark, 1975; Dahl, 1960; Fenton, 1962; Howe; 1976; Rischin, 1962; Shannon, 1963). This interpretation stresses the idea that Blacks are attempting to secure employment in those sectors of the economy in which selected immigrant minorities disproportionately appear.

Elaborating this last interpretation Gans (1972:301; see also Berube and Gittell, 1969) explains that conflict between Blacks and Jews in New York City was largely precipitated by underlying economic processes:

> The strikes were, I believe, largely an economic and political struggle over the succession process, and a class conflict, primarily over jobs, between the upwardly mobile black poor and a coalition of unions and other organizations representing white working class and lower middle class New Yorkers, people who might be described as 'sub-affluent' . . . the contested issues are over the economic positions of the participants, not their ethnic characteristics. When Negroes express their anger in anti-Semitic terms, it is only because many of the whites who affect their lives are Jewish; if the ghetto storeowners, landlords, and teachers were Chinese, Negro hostility would surely be anti-Chinese. Similarly, when Jews resort to overt racism, they do so primarily because they feel their economic and social position is threatened by blacks, just as they sometimes make racist remarks about 'the goyim' when their economic process is held back by non-Jews.

Similar interpretations of conflict between Blacks and white ethnics have been developed by Barbara (1972), Conforti (1972), Curvin (1972), Krickus (1975), Weed (1972), Weisbord and Stein (1970).

What is stressed in all three interpretations of ethnic and racial conflict is competition over scarce resources and labor market processes which pit one group against another in a struggle over jobs. All three interpretations emphasize structural rather than individualistic processes in attempt to explain the dynamics of ethnic and racial conflict. While all

three interpretations are plausible, very little data have been marshalled in attempt to assess empirically and systematically their explanatory power. Further, all three explanations partially describe elements or components of contemporary conflict between Blacks and white ethnic groups. Few attempts have been made to develop a more comprehensive theoretical model which incorporates the assumptions embodied in each interpretation.

LABOR MARKET SEGMENTATION AND RACIAL PREJUDICE: A SYNTHESIS AND AN EMPIRICAL TEST

Radical economists have developed and described the existence of a dual labor market within the American economy (Edwards, Reich, and Gordon, 1975; Gordon, 1972). Central to the dual labor market concept is the idea of segmentation (Edwards, 1975:16):

> The segmented markets are distinguished by separate systems of rules, different channels of information, and different skill and job requirements. Little mobility between the primary and secondary markets is thought to exist. Segmented and internal markets are often seen to be related, since the dichotemization of the industrial structure, of which the rise of large corporations with their internal markets forms one part, is seen as one cause of segmented (external) markets.

The idea of segmented labor markets provides a useful way to integrate the conceptual arguments embodied in existing structural explanations of ethnic conflict. As explained by Edwards (1975:16), "the idea of segmentation grew out of studies of poverty, unemployment, and oppressive job conditions of those persons working outside the normal white male career channels of middle-class America." What is unique about the use of segmentation in this study, however, is its application to white ethnic groups. While some scholars have discussed European capitalism in terms of immigrant placement in segmented labor markets, comparable applications have not been developed for the American industrial experience (Baron, 1975:209-210). Segmentation is typically described in racial rather than ethnic terms (Edwards, Reich, and Gordon (1975).

Considerable evidence exists documenting the extent to which Blacks disproportionately cluster within segmented labor markets, especially within secondary employment sectors. We know that selected industries are racially segregated (Baron, 1975; Baron and Hymer, 1967, Edwards, 1975). Additionally, within selected industries, there apparently exists a dual system of recruitment into various occupational categories (Piore, 1970; Gordon, 1972). Within many Northern cities, transportation and utilities, business, insurance and finance, and selected manufacturing industries are highly segregated (Baron and Hymer, 1968). And within both segregated and integrated industrial sectors, Blacks are typically concentrated in the lowest paying, blue collar or clerical jobs (Baron and Hymer, 1968; Taylor, 1968; Gwartney, 1970; Flanagan, 1973). This secondary labor market is comprised largely of less desirable, low paying jobs. Within the secondary labor market, "control is based on more open and arbitrary power, and the sanction of surplus labor tends to prevail" (Edwards, 1975:21).

What is not typically emphasized in discussions of segmented labor market conditions, however, is the extent to which selected white groups may also be found within particular industrial and occupational categories. The purpose of the research presented here is to report the results of an attempt to test the idea that racial prejudice and conflict between selected white ethnic groups and Black Americans is brought about by segmented labor market conditions. Generally, it was hypothesized that white ethnics who work in industries where Blacks compete for jobs are more racially intolerant and antagonistic than white ethnics who work in other industries. Specifically, it was hypothesized that the most intolerant ethnic groups are those employed within secondary or comparable labor markets populated by Blacks in search of employment opportunities.

The actual data used to examine the racial orientations and employment situations of white ethnic groups were drawn from the 15-city survey conducted by Campbell and Schuman.[1] The data were made available through the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research. Although the data were collected during the late 1960's they represent a good source of information with which to examine the issues at hand. First, the data were collected at precisely that point in time when racial tensions in Northern cities were greatest. Second, the cities surveyed were those with large ethnic populations.[2] Typically, most national survey data sets do not include enough Jews or Catholic ethnic groups to allow for meaningful analysis. Since Catholics and Jews are largely a Northern and Eastern urban population, the Campbell and Schuman study is an ideal source of secondary data for the present study. Additionally, Blacks residing in the same cities were surveyed. Consequently, relevant comparisons between Blacks and whites are possible.

In order to operationalize the idea of segmented labor market conditions, an analytical scheme based upon four variables was constructed: (1) annual family income, (2) industrial sector, (3) occupation, and (4) the relative presence of Blacks within different industrial sectors and occupational categories. Discussions of primary and secondary labor markets have typically made reference to all of these variables. While segmented conditions are typically viewed as logical manifestations of advanced capitalism (Baron, 1975), the characteristics of secondary labor markets include not only low pay, but also low skill requirements, specific industrial sectors, and racial segregation. In this sense, the scheme developed is based more upon the characteristics of particular labor markets rather than upon more global notions of structural sectors within the economy (Beck, Horar, Tolbert, 1978).

Following neo-Marxist conceptions of social stratification, analytical categories should be created in terms of a worker's "common position within the social relations of production" (Wright and Perrone, 1977:33; see also Edwards, 1975). Simple cutting points along income or occupational prestige dimensions do not produce the analytical categories embodied in the segmented labor market concept. Based upon neo-Marxist assumptions, nine analytical categories were established. Figure 1 shows the analytical scheme used to operationalize labor market segmentation.

FIGURE 1

ANALYTICAL CLASSIFICATION OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LABOR MARKETS

	Income Levels		
Working Class Occupations:	Low <$7,999	Medium $8,000-11,999	High >$12,000
Integrated Industries	Secondary labor markets	Secondary labor markets	mixed labor markets
Segregated Industries	Secondary labor markets	Secondary labor markets	mixed labor markets
Middle & Professional Class Occupations:	Mixed labor markets	Primary labor markets	Primary labor markets

Working class includes all blue collar occupations as well as clerical workers (Anderson, 1974; Wright and Perrone, 1977). Working class occupations were sub-divided into integrated and segregated industrial sectors. Based upon an examination of the distribution of Blacks within various industrial sectors, integrated industries were identified as construction, metal and steel, motor vehicle manufacturing, all sectors of the personal and professional services industry, and municipal and public service employment. Nearly sixty percent

of Blacks sampled were employed in these five industrial and employment sectors. Segregated industries include agriculture, mining, all sectors of manufacturing except metal and automotive, transportation, wholesale and retail trade, finance, insurance, and real estage. While Blacks were obviously present in these latter sectors of the economy, they were scattered throughout the numerous categories. Middle and professional classes include managers, owners, professional and sales workers in all sectors of the economy. This general category is highly segregated, irrespective of industry. Lastly, both the working, middle and professional class categories were stratified according to annual family income: low (less than $7,999), medium ($8,000 to $11,900), high (over $12,000 per year). Cutting points were based upon natural breaks in the data and a consideration of cell frequency.

With the possible exception of the lowest income strata, the middle and professional class category corresponds roughly to what the neo-Marxist economists would call the primary labor market. The middle and lower paying jobs within both working class categories correspond roughly to the secondary labor market. It is within the integrated industrial sectors of the working class, however, that one would expect to find the highest degrees of inter-group conflict and competition, especially within the middle and lower income categories. The higher paying working class sectors and the lowest paying middle and professional class categories undoubtedly contain both primary and secondary labor markets.

While this analytical scheme lacks the precision which more accurate and complete data might be capable of providing, it should nonetheless provide an adequate conceptual base to test the specific hypotheses which shaped the present research. (1) racial intolerance should be highest among those ethnic

groups concentrated in the same industrial, occupational, and income strata in which Blacks disproportionately appear. (2) the most racially tolerant groups should be those employed in high paying jobs, within highly segregated industrial and occupational categories.

In order to operationalize the racial orientations of ethnic groups, three specific measures were derived from the 15-city survey. General orientations toward inter-racial contact were measured by a five-point scale indicating varying preferences for selected types of inter-personal relations with Blacks.[3] A three-point scale measured the respondents' endorsement of civil rights legislation, dealing with employment and housing discrimination.[4] Another scale, a six-point cumulative index, measured varying degrees of sympathy with black protest.[5] All three scales deal with important facets of the civil rights movement during the late 1960's and early 1970's. All three scales index socio-political concerns conceptually related to inter-group competition and conflict. Additionally, two of the scales are conceptually linked to the idea that the government should intervene in behalf of Black Americans for purposes of insuring economic opportunity and social mobility.

Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents according to the analytical scheme used to conceptualize labor market segmentation.

(TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE)

The data appearing in Table 1 are revealing.[6] First, nearly 88% of Black respondents fell within the working class categories. Nearly 80% of Blacks were employed in the lowest paying jobs in both the segregated and integrated industrial sectors of the working class--in secondary labor markets. Among Catholic groups, Eastern Europeans and Italians had the highest proportion of respondents in the working class categories, nearly 80%. Among Protestants, the Irish had the highest proportion appearing in the working class category,

over 80%. Jews had the highest proportion of respondents appearing in the middle and professional class categories, 64.4%. French and Irish Catholics, British, Scandinavians, and the residual others also had a comparatively higher number of respondents in the middle and professional class categories, 40.9%, 29.4%, 33.9%, 57.1%, and 44% respectively.

On the basis of the data appearing in Table 1, one would expect to find significant differences in the racial orientations of ethnic groups. More specifically, one would expect to find high levels of tolerance among Jews, French and Irish Catholics, British Protestants, Scandinavians, and the residual others. The lowest levels of racial tolerance should be found among Eastern Europeans, Italians, and Irish Protestants. Simply, racial intolerance is viewed as a response to potential economic competition. Groups not in direct competition with Blacks should experience fewer incentives to adopt a racially intolerant posture.

Table 2 shows the analysis of racial orientations, according to religio-ethnic identification. Using the .01 level, the F-ratio indicates that differences between groups are probably not a result of sampling error. More importantly, differences between groups are generally in the direction predicted. Jews, Irish and French Catholics, British Protestants, Scandinavians, and the residual others consistently revealed the highest scores of racial tolerance. Irish Protestants, Eastern Europeans, and Italians generally revealed the lowest scores.

(TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE)

The argument up to this point can be summarized briefly. According to the segmented labor market interpretation, Irish Protestants, Eastern Europeans, and Italians are more racially intolerant because they are partly concentrated

in secondary labor markets within integrated industries, and in direct competition with Blacks and other groups for jobs, pay, and advancement. On the other hand, groups exhibiting racial tolerance are farther removed from Blacks financially, occupationally, and industrially. They may be employed within secondary labor markets but in segregated industries, or employed within primary labor markets.

Within the context of immigration history, the argument being developed appears reasonable. Italians and Eastern Europeans were generally part of the "second wave" of immigration from Europe (Dinnerstein and Reimers, 1975; Handlin, 1955), and are the more recent arrivals to Northern cities. Additionally, while most Protestant groups in the sample were raised in Northern cities, nearly 50% of Irish Protestants tended to be first generation, Southern migrants. And even though many Jews were part of the second wave of European immigration, their business, commercial, and union activities largely developed in a specialized fashion, insulating many from widespread involvement in working class jobs in manufacturing or heavy industry (Howe, 1974; Rischin, 1968). Consequently, Jewish immigrants have partially escaped direct competition with Blacks for jobs in the secondary labor market, especially in the manufacturing sector.

If the segmented labor market interpretation of inter-group conflict is correct, however, racial prejudice and competition between groups should dissipate when the conditions which produce a segmented labor market are controlled or eliminated. Generally, the theory implies there should be nothing psychologically or historically peculiar about Eastern European, Italian, or Irish Protestant culture which compels members of these groups to exhibit racially intolerant attitudes. Likewise, there is nothing culturally relevant about the Jewish, Irish Catholic, or British Protestant

experience that leads members of these groups to adopt a racially tolerant posture. Specifically, Jews, Irish Catholics, and British Protestants, at the levels of the working-class, especially those employed in secondary labor markets within integrated industrial sectors, should be as racially intolerant as their Italian, Irish Protestant, and Eastern European counterparts. Likewise, highly paid Italian and Eastern European professional and sales workers should be as racially tolerant as their Irish Catholic, Jewish, and British Protestant counterparts who are employed in primary labor markets.

Analytically, then, one should expect to find that differences between ethnic groups, within industrial and occupational categories, are statistically insignificant. Table 3 shows the analysis of ethnic differences within the appropriate analytical categories. The .01 level was used to reject the null hypothesis, which in this case must be confirmed in order to substantiate the segmented labor market interpretation. Although French and Scandinavian respondents had to be eliminated from the analysis because of an insufficient number of cases, the data generally confirm the interpretation being developed. Of the 27 specific analyses, the null hypothesis was accepted 25 times. This means that ethnic differences within industrial and occupational categories are probably due to sampling error.

(TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE)

Because of case losses, firm genralizations are difficult. Consequently, some degree of prudence should be exercised when interpreting the data. Nonetheless, the patterns revealed in the data are generally in the directions predicted. In the analysis of the three dependent variables, the scores of the more tolerant groups generally decrease as the analysis moves from the highest levels of the middle and professional classes to the lowest levels of

of integrated industries within the working class, or more generally from the primary to the secondary labor market. Likewise, the scores of the least tolerant groups generally rise as labor market conditions are analytically controlled.

Despite the problems of case loss and the absence of more precise measures of employment situations which promote inter-group competition and conflict, the findings can be used to develop a logical case in support of the segmented labor market interpretation. Generally, occupational and industrial affiliation erases nearly all differences in racial orientations between ethnic groups. Consequently, it seems reasonable to suggest that differences between occupational and industrial categories are of greater theoretical significance than differences between ethnic groups (Table 4).

(TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE)

It is possible to suggest alternatives to the segmented labor market theory--that elites rationally promote racism through hiring practices that divide the working class (Cummings, 1977), or that education reduces the sharpest edges of racial intolerance. These interpretations, however, do not explain why conflict and antagonism takes on explicitly ethnic or racial dimensions, or why conflict occurs between particular ethnic or racial groups. These alternative explanations, while linked to stratification theory, are more abstract models of racial intolerance, and do not appear to possess a sufficient degree of precision to explain conflict occurring on a specific historical or situational milieu. The alternative interpretations are formulated in isolation from actual manifestations of conflict and competion.

Discussion

It is important to acknowledge the difficulties involved in testing the segmented labor market theory through use of survey data. An analysis

of racial attitudes and orientations in the abstract, in isolation from specific historical or situational manifestations of conflict and competition, is an incomplete test of the theory. Additionally, given the problems of secondary data analysis--an imprecise mesh between concepts and operational measures, small N's in key analytical categories--the problems associated with designing a rigorous test of the theory are multiple. Despite these important methodological problems, however, the data still show relatively strong support for the model being tested.

The data suggest that high scores of racial intolerance are strongly associated with a group's relationship to the economy, as well as the larger socio-historical factors connected with industrialization and time of immigration. Ethnicity, per se, does not appear to be an influential force shaping the racial orientations of white Americans. Scores between ethnic groups, within working, middle and professional class categories, are neither large nor systematic. In this respect, the findings in this study partially corroborate recent observations by Yancey, Ericksen, and Juliani (1975:399): ". . . much of the behavior commonly associated with ethnicity is largely a function of the structural situations in which groups have found themselves."

What is of theoretical importance, however, are the employment and general economic situations which activate contemporary antagonism between Blacks and white ethnic groups. Historically, we know that European immigration corresponded directly to patterns of American industrial expansion (Erickson, 1957). Additionally, considerable evidence exists which shows that selected groups not only entered the economy at varying stages of industrial development, but also secured employment in very different industrial and occupational sectors (Yancey, Ericksen, Juliani, 1975). The evidence and argument presented

in this article suggests that competition within secondary labor markets is an impetus generating inter-group conflict. At an earlier point in time, hiring practices which promoted "scabbing" and strike-breaking fueled ethnic antagonism. Additionally, political conflict over immigration legislation, exclusion acts, and contract labor laws were related to the same labor market practices which produced ethnic antagonism (Erickson, 1957; Hill, 1973).

These earlier manifestations of ethnic conflict and competition have theoretical import for contemporary conflict. As has already been suggested, one of the probable unintended consequences of the recent legislative efforts to alleviate racial injustice was to pit non-white minorities against selected white ethnic groups in a struggle over jobs and living space. The assumption underlying much of the social legislation designed to assist non-white minorities was that discrimination in the labor market is anti-thetical to the ideas of equal opportunity and meritocratic competitive principles (Bell, 1972). However, some recent policies based upon affirmation action hiring, quota schemes, and open admissions may not be based upon meritocratic principles but upon the idea of representative equality (Bell, 1972; Glazer, 1976). It seems obvious to suggest, then, that it is in the best interests of Blacks and other non-white minorities to argue in support of quotas and affirmative action hiring. But if certain ethnic groups occupy selected occupations, within selected industries, as they in fact often do, and Blacks are attempting to enter that sector, then the stage is set for the kind of antagonism predicted by theories of ethnic conflict premised upon labor market processes (e.g., Bonacich, 1972; Gans, 1972). Antagonism should be fueled by legislation designed to expedite the entry of certain groups into selected occupational categories. In this respect, earlier conflict over unrestriction immigration and

contract labor laws earlier in the century is similar to the debate over affirmatives action. Over and above the attempt to legislate labor market policies, however, the theory being addressed in this study suggests that one group's search for employment and well-being may jeopardize another group's financial self interest.

Theoretically, the labor market segmentation interpretation illuminates some of the dynamics linked with contemporary antagonism. While the evidence and argument presented in this article do not prove that recent legislation poses a real as opposed to a perceived threat to the vested interests of selected white groups, especially those employed in the secondary labor market, the similarity between past and present forms of ethnic conflict are striking. It appears that selected white ethnic groups still comprise a large proportion of the secondary labor market, further complicating what initially appears to be a simple matter of white over Black. Given the position in the Northern labor market of Eastern European and Italian Catholics, as well as Irish Protestants, it is predictable that high levels of racial intolerance and exclusionist attitudes are exhibited by members of these groups. While the theory enables social scientists to understand better the dynamics of intergroup conflict, the political aspects of ethnic and racial antagonism are difficult to diffuse.

Politically, it appears that while members of particular working and middle class ethnic groups are busy protecting their own interests, the crucial factor generating competition in the labor market--a tenuous and unstable economy--is never clearly identified or addressed (Baron, 1975; Edwards, 1975). That is, larger legislative issues such as full employment, (Gartner, Lynch, Riessman, 1976), taxation policies which redistribute wealth and income (Thurow, 1976), public control over private investment or even the nationalization of industry

(Harrington, 1976) are not part of the political agenda associated with discussions of the new ethnicity, or the American racial crisis.

Most discussions of the new ethnicity are highly polemical or presented within an individualistic or submerged anti-Black framework (Jackson, 1973; Kahane, 1971; Krickus, 1975; Novak, 1971). While racial injustice is obviously one of the most pressing problems facing American society, it seems equally obvious that social reforms which do not address the economy itself but pit groups in a struggle over scarce resources, create the conditions which feed rather than alleviate racial antagonism. If racial reform is defined solely along individualistic rather than structural and economic lines, an inevitable outcome seems to be the dilution and postponement of larger policies designed to provide full employment, redistribute wealth and income, or generally alleviate the economic processes which generate uncertain employment situations. If this is the case, the conclusion suggested is substantial agreement with a prediction made over a decade ago by Coles (1966:57); until the problem of class inequality is resolved:

> . . . the bitterness and resentment we see between whites and Negroes will continue, and perhaps increase.

Footnotes

[1]See Angus Campbell and Howard Schuman, "Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities," in Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Washington, D. C : U. S. Government Printing Office, July, 1968).

[2]All cities surveyed have large minority populations: Baltimore, Boston, Brooklyn, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Gary, Milwaukee, Newark, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, Washington, D. C.

[3]The following items were used to measure general orientations toward contact. The response weighting is indicated in parentheses.

a. Suppose you had a job where your supervisor was a qualified Negro. Would you mind that a lot, a little, or not at all? (respondent says, "not at all," or "would like it").

b. If a Negro family with about the same income and education as you moved next door to you, would you mind it a lot, a little, or not at all? (respondent says "not at all," or "would like it").

c. Who do you feel you could more easily become friends with--a Negro with the same education and income as you, or a white person with a different education and income from you? (respondent says "Negro with same," or "makes no difference").

d. If you had small children, would you rather they had only white friends, or would you like to see them have Negro friends too, or wouldn't you care one way or the other? (respondent says "Negro friends too").

[4]Support of civil rights legislation was measured by three items.

a. Which of these statements would you agree with--first, white people have a right to keep Negroes out of their neighborhoods if they want to, or second, Negroes have a right to live wherever they can afford to just like white people.

1. Whites have right to keep Negroes out
2. Negroes have right to live anywhere
3. Other
4. All right to have Negroes if "right kind" (income, class, etc.)
5. R agrees with statements; both are right.

b. Do you favor or oppose laws to prevent discrimination against Negroes in job hiring and promotion?

c. How about laws to prevent discrimination against Negroes in buying or renting houses and apartments? Do you favor or oppose such laws?

If respondents feel whites can keep Negroes out of neighborhoods, and are opposed to undecided about the legislation options presented, they received a score of one on the scale. If they supported only one type of legislation, and opposed the other, they received a score of two. If they supported one type of legislation and were undecided about another, they received a score of three. And if they favored both types of legislation, they received a score of four.

[5]Sympathy with Black protest was determined by responses to five questions: Scale scores are indicated in parentheses:

a. Some people say these disturbances which occurred in Newark and Detroit in the summer of 1967 are mainly a protest by Negroes against unfair conditions. Others say they are mainly a way of looting and things like that. Which of these seems more correst to you: (respondent says "mainly protest").

b. Do you think the large disturbances like those in Detroit and Newark were planned in advance, or that there was some planning but not much, or weren't they planned at all? (respondent says "some planned" or "not planned at all").

c. Negroes are justified in protesting through sit-ins? (respondent feels protests are justified).

d. Some Negro leaders are talking about having non-violent marches and demonstrations in several cities in 1968 to protest lack of opportunity for Negroes. Do you think such demonstrations are different from riots, or that there is no real difference? (respondent says "are different from riots").

e. Some say that Negroes have been pushing too fast for what they want. Others feel they haven't pushed fast enough. How about you--do you think Negroes are trying to push too fast, are going too slowly, or are moving at about the right speed? (respondent says "about the right speed," or "too slowly").

[6]Religio-ethnic identification was measured by an item asking: "Which country did most of your ancestors come from?" Eastern European includes Poland, Hungary, Russia, Armenia, Eastonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. British includes Great Britain, Scotland, and Wales.

TABLE 1

EMPLOYMENT SITUATION BY RELIGIO-ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION

	Black	Catholic: Other	French	German	Irish	East. Europe	Italian	Protestant: Other	German	British	Irish	Scan.	Jews	Other
WORKING CLASS														
Integrated Industries														
Low (secondary)	32.6	22.0	9.1	12.7	14.9	16.7	15.6	20.1	15.0	14.9	29.5	22.9	6.9	15.2
Medium (secondary)	12.7	14.6	4.5	18.2	12.9	18.7	17.0	13.4	14.1	8.6	11.5	2.9	3.7	11.2
High (mixed)	5.2	4.7	.0	4.8	6.7	6.6	3.8	3.9	5.6	6.3	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.2
Segregated Industries														
Low (secondary)	24.0	14.6	31.8	18.2	18.6	19.7	24.0	20.7	15.5	20.1	23.1	8.6	7.8	12.8
Medium (secondary)	9.8	11.8	4.5	13.3	9.3	11.6	12.8	10.1	14.6	9.8	9.0	.0	4.6	9.6
High (mixed)	3.6	4.3	9.1	4.2	8.2	5.1	6.3	6.7	6.6	6.3	5.1	5.7	6.4	4.0
MIDDLE & PROFESSIONAL CLASSES														
Low (mixed)	5.2	10.6	.0	9.1	6.7	4.5	5.9	8.9	8.5	10.3	9.0	11.4	12.4	12.0
Medium (primary)	2.9	6.3	22.7	12.7	12.4	8.6	8.3	6.7	10.8	9.2	6.4	17.1	18.8	16.0
High (primary)	3.9	11.0	18.2	6.7	10.3	8.6	6.2	9.5	9.4	14.4	3.8	28.6	36.2	16.0
	2,276	254	22	165	194	198	288	179	213	174	78	35	218	125

TABLE 2

ORIENTATION TOWARD INTER-RACIAL CONTACT, CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION, AND BLACK PROTEST BY RELIGIO-ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION

	Inter-Racial Contact		Civil Rights		Black Protest	
Protestant:						
British	(200)	1.98	(194)	2.47	(208)	2.24
Irish	(88)	1.56	(85)	2.51	(90)	1.72
German	(239)	1.82	(241)	2.48	(247)	1.95
Scandinavian	(38)	1.97	(35)	2.46	(38)	2.58
Other	(207)	1.84	(205)	2.39	(213)	1.88
Catholic:						
French	(23)	1.91	(25)	2.76	(26)	2.58
German	(184)	1.76	(184)	2.5	(189)	1.86
Irish	(242)	1.98	(237)	2.79	(248)	2.24
Eastern Europe	(225)	1.59	(231)	2.37	(236)	1.58
Italian	(329)	1.85	(232)	2.42	(342)	1.74
Other	(297)	1.85	(296)	2.53	(312)	1.99
Jewish	(168)	2.18	(246)	3.16	(257)	2.68
Other	(168)	2.14	(163)	2.51	(177)	2.31
	$\overline{X}$ = 1.87		$\overline{X}$ = 2.58		$\overline{X}$ = 2.06	
	F = 6.17		F = 10.07		F = 10.86	
	P < .01		P < .01		P < .01	

TABLE 3

ORIENTATION TOWARD INTER-RACIAL CONTACT, CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION, AND BLACK PROTEST BY RELIGIO-ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION CONTROLLING FOR SOCIAL EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Inter-Racial Contact

	Working Class						Middle & Professional Classes		
	Integrated Industries			Segregated Industries					
	Low Secondary	Med. Secondary	High Mixed	Low Secondary	Med. Secondary	High Mixed	Low Mixed	Medium Primary	High Primary
Protestant:									
British	(24) 1.9	(15) 1.9	(11) 1.7	(34) 1.9	(17) 1.2	(11) 1.8	(10) 1.7	(16) 1.8	(23) 2.0
Irish	(22) 1.4	(9) 1.6	(2) 2.1	(18) 1.4	(7) 2.0	(4) 1.8	(7) 1.1	(5) 1.6	(3) 2.0
German	(32) 1.5	(30) 1.9	(12) 1.9	(31) 1.7	(31) 2.0	(14) 1.5	(18) 1.9	(22) 2.0	(18) 1.8
Other	(35) 1.4	(22) 2.0	(7) 1.4	(37) 1.6	(18) 1.9	(11) 2.1	(16) 2.3	(12) 2.3	(17) 2.2
Catholic:									
German	(20) 1.75	(30) 1.7	(8) 1.9	(29) 1.5	(22) 1.4	(7) 2.1	(14) 1.6	(21) 1.9	(10) 2.4
Irish	(28) 2.2	(25) 1.8	(12) 1.7	(36) 1.7	(18) 1.9	(16) 2.0	(12) 2.7	(24) 2.0	(20) 2.1
Eastern Europe	(31) 1.7	(36) 1.6	(12) 1.5	(37) 1.5	(22) 1.2	(10) 1.6	(9) 1.9	(17) 1.7	(17) 1.4
Italian	(43) 1.9	(48) 1.5	(9) 1.7	(18) 1.5	(36) 1.9	(17) 1.3	(16) 1.8	(23) 1.8	(18) 2.3
Other	(20) 1.56	(36) 1.9	(12) 2.2	(34) 2.2	(28) 1.5	(10) 2.1	(26) 2.0	(16) 1.9	(28) 1.9
Jewish	(14) 1.8	(8) 1.5	(7) 1.6	(17) 2.0	(10) 2.0	(14) 2.4	(25) 2.2	(39) 2.4	(78) 2.3
Other	(18) 1.9	(14) 1.9	(4) 1.5	(15) 1.9	(12) 1.75	(3) 2.2	(15) 2.5	(17) 2.2	(20) 2.4
	$\overline{X}$ = 1.7	$\overline{X}$ = 1.7	$\overline{X}$ = 1.7	$\overline{X}$ = 1.7	$\overline{X}$ = 1.7	$\overline{X}$ = 1.9	$\overline{X}$ = 2.0	$\overline{X}$ = 2.0	$\overline{X}$ = 2.2
	F = 1.8	F = .78	F = .52	F = 1.4	F = 2.2	F = 1.3	F = 1.6	F = 1.1	F = 2.7
	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P < .01

TABLE 3 CONT.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

	Working Class						Middle & Professional Classes		
	Integrated Industries			Segregated Industries					
	Low Secondary	Med. Secondary	High Mixed	Low Secondary	Med. Secondary	High Mixed	Low Mixed	Med. Primary	High Primary
Protestant:									
British	(25) 2.3	(14) 2.0	(10) 2.2	(33) 2.4	(17) 2.2	(11) 2.4	(14) 2.8	(14) 2.8	(23) 2.7
Irish	(22) 2.2	(9) 1.5	(2) 1.5	(17) 2.4	(7) 2.9	(4) 2.8	(6) 3.5	(5) 2.2	(3) 2.7
German	(32) 2.5	(30) 2.3	(12) 2.3	(32) 2.6	(31) 2.5	(13) 2.5	(17) 2.4	(22) 2.7	(20) 2.6
Other	(34) 2.0	(24) 2.3	(7) 2.0	(36) 2.3	(18) 2.3	(12) 2.7	(15) 3.1	(12) 2.7	(16) 3.1
Catholic:									
German	(21) 2.5	(27) 2.8	(8) 2.1	(29) 2.3	(22) 2.3	(7) 3.3	(15) 2.5	(21) 2.2	(11) 2.6
Irish	(26) 2.9	(25) 2.8	(13) 2.5	(34) 2.6	(17) 2.9	(15) 2.5	(12) 2.8	(23) 3.0	(18) 3.2
Eastern Europe	(32) 2.3	(37) 2.2	(13) 2.4	(38) 2.2	(21) 2.7	(10) 2.2	(9) 2.2	(17) 2.6	(17) 2.4
Italian	(44) 2.5	(47) 2.3	(11) 2.4	(67) 2.4	(36) 2.5	(18) 2.3	(16) 2.0	(23) 2.5	(18) 3.0
Other	(55) 2.2	(36) 2.8	(11) 2.6	(34) 2.8	(28) 2.0	(11) 2.9	(25) 2.6	(13) 2.9	(27) 2.8
Jewish:	(15) 3.0	(8) 2.5	(7) 3.6	(17) 2.9	(10) 3.0	(13) 3.4	(28) 3.0	(39) 3.3	(75) 3.2
Other:	(14) 2.2	(12) 1.9	(4) 2.0	(16) 2.1	(11) 2.4	(4) 2.8	(15) 3.0	(20) 2.5	(19) 2.6
	$\bar{X}$ = 2.4	$\bar{X}$ = 2.4	$\bar{X}$ = 2.5	$\bar{X}$ = 2.5	$\bar{X}$ = 2.4	$\bar{X}$ = 2.6	$\bar{X}$ = 2.7	$\bar{X}$ = 2.8	$\bar{X}$ = 2.9
	F = 1.4	F = 1.5	F = 1.2	F = .96	F = 1.2	F = 1.3	F = 1.4	F = 1.6	F = 1.3
	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01

TABLE 3 CONT.

BLACK PROTEST

	Working Class						Middle & Professional Classes		
	Integrated Industries			Segregated Industries					
	Low Secondary	Med. Secondary	High Mixed	Low Secondary	Med. Secondary	High Mixed	Low Mixed	Medium Primary	High Primary
Protestant:									
British	(26) 2.0	(15) 1.6	(11) 1.6	(35) 1.8	(17) 1.8	(11) 2.3	(18) 2.3	(16) 2.5	(25) 2.9
Irish	(23) 1.0	(9) 1.9	(2) 1.0	(18) 1.7	(7) 1.9	(4) 1.5	(7) 2.3	(5) 2.8	(3) 2.3
German	(32) 1.7	(20) 2.2	(12) 2.9	(33) 1.5	(31) 1.5	(14) 2.1	(18) 2.3	(23) 2.4	(20) 2.2
Other	(36) 1.7	(24) 2.0	(7) 1.9	(37) 1.2	(18) 2.0	(12) 1.8	(16) 2.3	(12) 2.4	(17) 3.0
Catholic:									
German	(21) 1.8	(30) 2.1	(8) .8	(30) 1.3	(22) 1.6	(7) 1.7	(15) 1.7	(21) 2.0	(11) 3.1
Irish	(29) 2.4	(25) 2.1	(13) 2.5	(36) 1.8	(18) 1.9	(16) 2.6	(13) 2.4	(24) 2.5	(20) 2.5
Eastern Europe	(33) 1.2	(37) 1.3	(13) 1.7	(38) 1.2	(23) 2.2	(10) 1.6	(9) 1.8	(17) 1.9	(17) 2.1
Italian	(45) 1.6	(49) 1.8	(11) 2.4	(69) 1.7	(37) 1.5	(18) 1.7	(17) 1.5	(24) 1.9	(18) 2.3
Other	(55) 1.8	(37) 1.9	(12) 1.8	(37) 2.3	(30) 2.0	(11) 1.7	(27) 1.9	(16) 2.4	(28) 2.6
Jewish:	(15) 2.1	(8) 2.1	(7) 3.0	(17) 2.2	(10) 2.2	(14) 2.1	(27) 2.6	(41) 2.8	(79) 3.0
Other:	(19) 1.8	(14) 1.6	(4) 1.75	(16) 2.6	(12) 1.8	(5) 3.0	(15) 2.7	(20) 2.7	(20) 2.3
	$\bar{X}$ = 1.76	$\bar{X}$ = 1.9	$\bar{X}$ = 2.0	$\bar{X}$ = 1.7	$\bar{X}$ = 1.8	$\bar{X}$ = 2.0	$\bar{X}$ = 2.2	$\bar{X}$ = 2.4	$\bar{X}$ = 2.7
	F = 1.8	F = 1.1	F = 2.0	F = 3.2	F = .7	F = .96	F = 1.0	F = 1.8	F = 1.5
	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P < .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01	P > .01

TABLE 4

ORIENTATION TOWARD INTER-RACIAL CONTACT, CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION, AND BLACK PROTEST BY SOCIAL CLASS POSITION

	Inter-Racial Contact	Civil Rights	Black Protest
WORKING CLASS			
Intergrated Industries			
Low (Secondary)	(331) 1.7	(329) 2.36	(344) 1.74
Medium (Secondary)	(275) 1.73	(271) 2.43	(280) 1.86
High (Mixed)	(97) 1.74	(99) 2.41	(101) 2.06
Segregated Industries			
Low (Secondary)	(365) 1.7	(362) 2.45	(377) 1.71
Medium (Secondary)	(222) 1.7	(219) 2.44	(226) 1.80
High (Mixed)	(122) 1.9	(122) 2.65	(126) 2.04
MIDDLE AND PROFESSIONAL CLASSES			
Low (Mixed)	(178) 2.0	(175) 2.67	(186) 2.16
Medium (Primary)	(222) 2.05	(220) 2.75	(230) 2.44
High (Primary)	(266) 2.2	(259) 2.88	(272) 2.67
	$\bar{X}$ = 1.8	$\bar{X}$ = 2.6	$\bar{X}$ = 2.0
	F = 6.9	F = 4.9	F = 15.1
	P < .01	P = < .01	P = < .01

REFERENCES

Anderson, Charles
1974 — The Political Economy of Social Class. (Englewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall).

Barbara, Fred
1972 — "Political Brokers," Society 9, (Sept./Oct.): 42-54.

Baron, Harold
1975 — "Racial Domination in Advanced Capitalism: A Theory of Nationalism and Divisions in the Labor Market," in Richard Edwards et. al. (eds.), Labor Market Segmentation, (Lexington: D. C. Heath): 173-216.

_____ and Bennett Hymer
1968 — "The Negro Worker in the Chicago Labor Market," in Julius Jacobson, (ed.), The Negro and the American Labor Movement. (New York: Doubleday): 232-285.

Beck, E. M., Patrick Horan, and Charles Tolbert, II
1978 — "Stratification in a Dual Economy: A Sectoral Model of Earnings Determination," American Sociological Review 43 (October): 704-720.

Bell, Daniel
1972 — "On Meritocracy and Equality," The Public Interest 29, (Fall): 29-68.

Berube, Maurice and Marilyn Gittell (eds.)
1969 — Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville (New York: Praeger).

Berthoff, Rowland
1968 — British Immigrants in Industrial America, 1790-1950. (New York: Russell and Russell).

Bonacich, Edna
1972 — "The Split Labor Market: A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism," American Sociological Review 37, (Oct): 547-559.

_____
1975 — "Abolition, the Extension of Slavery, and the Positions of Free Blacks: A Study of the Split Labor Market in the United States, 1830-1863, American Journal of Sociology, 81 (December): 601-628.

_____ 1976 "Advanced Capitalism and Black/White Relations in the United States: A Split Labor Market Interpretation, American Sociological Review, 41 (February): 34-51.

Clark, Terry N. 1975 "The Irish Ethnic and the Spirit of Patronage," Ethnicity 2 (Winter): 305-359.

Cole, D. B. 1966 Immigrant City (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).

Coles, Robert 1966 "The White Northerner: Pride and Prejudice," Atlantic Monthly. (June): 53-63.

Conforti, Joseph "Ghetto or City," Society 9 (Sept./Oct.): 28-32.

Cummings, Scott 1977 "Racial Prejudice and Political Orientations Among Blue Collar Workers," Social Science Quarterly (March): 907-920.

Curvin, Robert "Black Power in City Hall," Society (Sept./Oct.): 55-58.

Dahl, Robert 1960 Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Dinnerstein, Leonard and David Reimers 1975 Ethnic Americans, (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company).

Edwards, Richard 1975 "The Social Relations of Production in the Firm and Labor Market Structure" in Richard Edwards, et. al. (eds.) Labor Market Segmentation (Lexington: D. C. Heath): 3-26.

_____ and Michael Reich and David Gordon 1975 Labor Market Segmentation (Lexington: D. C. Heath).

Erickson, Charlotte
1957 American Industry and the European Immigrant (New York: Russell and Russell.

Fenton, Edwin
1962 Immigrants and Unions, A Case Study: Italians and American Labor, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Fitch, John
1969 The Steelworkers (New York: Arno Press).

Flanagan, Robert S.
1973 "Racial Wage Discrimination and Employment Segregation," Journal of Human Resources, (Fall).

Ford, Maurice DeG.
1975 "Busing in Boston," Commonweal 10, (October): 456-460.

Gans, Herbert
1972 "Negro-Jewish Conflict in New York," in Peter I. Rose (ed.) Nation of Nations (New York: Random House): 294-308.

Glazer, Nathan
1976 Affirmative Discrimination (New York: Basic Books).

Golab, Caroline
1973 "The Immigrant and the City, Poles, Italians, and Jews in Philadelphia, 1970-1920," in Allen Davis and Mork Haller (eds.), The Peoples of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Gartner, Alan, William Lynch and Frank Riessman (eds.)
1976 A Full Employment Program for the 1970's (New York: Praeger).

Gordon, David
1972 Theories of Poverty and Underemployment (Lexington: D. C. Heath).

Greeley, Andrew
1974 Ethnicity in the United States (New York: John Wiley and Sons).

Gwartney, John
1970 "Discrimination and Income Differentials," American Economic Review (June).

Greene, Victor
1968 The Slavic Community on Strike (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press).

Handlin, Oscar (ed.)
1959 Immigration (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall).

Harrington, Michael
1976 The Twilight of Capitalism (New York: Simon and Schuster).

Hentoff, Nat (ed.)
1972 Black Anti-Semitism and Jewish Racism (New York: Schocken).

Hill, Herbert
1973 "Anti Oriental Agitation and the Rise of Working Class Racism," Society 10 (January/Febrlary): 43-54.

Howe, Irving
1976 World of Our Fathers (New York: Simon and Schuster).

Jackson, Agnes Morehead
1973 "To See the 'Me' In Thee: Challenge to All White Americans, or, White Ethnicity from a Black Perspective and a Sometimes Response to Michael Novak, in Sallie Te Selle (ed.), The Rediscovery of Ethnicity (New York: Harper and Row).

Kahane, Meir
1971 Never Again (New York: Pyramid Books).

Katz, Shlomo (ed.)
1967 Negro and Jew (New York: MacMillan Company).

Kornblum, William
1974 Blue Collar Community (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Krickus, Richard
1975 Pursuing the American Dream (New York: Doubleday).

Miller, Alan
1972 "Black Anti-Semitism-Jewish Racism," in Nat Hentoff (ed.) Black Anti-Semitism and Jewish Racism (New York: Schocken Books): 79-114.

Novak, Michael
1971 — The Rise of Unmeltable Ethnics (New York: MacMillan Company).

Phillips, Kevin
1969 — The Emerging Republican Majority (New York: Arlington House).

Piore, Michael
1970 — "Jobs and Training," in Samuel Beer and Richard Barringer (eds.) The State and the Poor (Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers).

Raab, Earl
1972 — "The Black Revolution and the Jewish Question," in Nat Hentoff (ed.) Black Anti-Semitism and Jewish Racism (New York: Schocken Books): 15-34.

Rischin, Moses
1962 — The Promised City (New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rosenblum, Gerald
1973 — Immigrant Workers (New York: Edward-MaCann Books).

Schrag, Peter
1970a — The Decline of the Wasp (New York: Simon and Schuster).

———
1970b — The Forgotten Americans, Harper's Magazine (August): 27-34.

Shannon, William
1963 — The American Irish (New York: MacMillan).

Stolarik, M. Mark
1972 — Immigration and Urbanization: The Slovak Experience: 1870-1918. unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Supplementary Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders
1968 — (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office).

Taylor, David P.
1968 — "Discrimination and Occupational Wage Differences in the Market for Unskilled Labor," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, (April).

Thurow, Lester
1976 "Popular Mechanics: The Redistribution of Wealth," Working Papers for a New Society (Winter): 23-27.

Weed, Perry
1973 The White Ethnic Movement and Ethnic Politics (New York: Praeger).

Weisbord, Robert and Artuhr Stein
1970 Bittersweet Encounter (New York: Schocken Books).

Wright, Erik and Luca Perrone
1977 "Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality," American Sociological Review, 42 (February): 32-55.

Yancey, William, Eugene Ericksen, and Richard Juliani
1975 "Emergent Ethnicity: A Review and Reformation," American Sociological Review, 41 (June): 391-403.